

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

THINK COMPUTER FOUNDATION, et
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-02396-BLF](#)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO
WHY THE COMPLAINT SHOULD NOT
BE DISMISSED**

[Re: ECF No. 11]

TO PLAINTIFFS THINK COMPUTER FOUNDATION AND THINK COMPUTER
CORPORATION:

YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 3-9(B) AND FEDERAL
COURT PRECEDENT FOR FAILURE TO BE REPRESENTED BY LICENSED COUNSEL
ON THE GROUNDS SET FORTH BELOW.

On May 23, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint in the above-captioned action. (ECF 1) On
that same date, Plaintiffs filed a Motion with the Court seeking permission for electronic case
filing. (ECF 3) Both documents list "Aaron Greenspan" as appearing *pro se on behalf of* Think
Computer Corporation and Think Computer Foundation.

The rules of this Court make clear that a corporation or other entity may appear in Court
only through an attorney licensed to practice law before the Court. Civil L-R 3-9(b) ("A
corporation, unincorporated association, partnership, or other such entity may appear only through
a member of the bar of this Court."). The United States Supreme Court has held that such rules are
constitutional, *see Rowland v. Calif. Men's Colony*, 506 U.S. 194 (1993), and the Ninth Circuit
has upheld district court orders entering default judgment against a Plaintiff entity that refused to

1 retain counsel for the duration of litigation. *United States v. High Country Broad. Co.*, 3 F.3d
2 1244, 1245 (1993).

3 It has been brought to the Court's attention that Mr. Greenspan is not an attorney licensed
4 to practice law in the state of California, (ECF 11) and as such, under the prevailing law and rules
5 of this Court, cannot represent an entity in action before this Court.

6 THE COURT hereby issues an ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE why Plaintiffs' claims should
7 not be dismissed for failure to be represented by counsel, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-9(b) and
8 prevailing case law.

9 The deadline for responding to the Order to Show Cause will be July 9, 2014, thirty (30)
10 days from the issuance of this Order. If Plaintiff fails to file a response, the case shall be
11 dismissed. The Court shall not hold a hearing on this Order unless otherwise stated.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: June 11, 2014

14 
15 HON. BETH LABSON FREEMAN
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28